

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing reply, claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 12 and 14-30 are pending in the application, with 1, 21, and 22 being the independent claims. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, and 14-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,209,016 to Hobson et al. (hereafter "Hobson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,237,016 to Fischer et al. (hereafter "Fischer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,634 to Peleg et al. (hereafter "Peleg") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0039420 to Shacham et al. (hereafter "Shacham"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and provide the following arguments to support patentability.

The Office Action dated March 23, 2007 (herein "Office Action") alleges the teachings of Hobson, Fischer, and Peleg may be combined with the teachings of Shacham to render claim 1 obvious. Applicants assert that Shacham is an improper reference because it is not prior art against the instant application. The earliest effective date for Shacham is a provisional application filed on June 12, 2000. However, the instant application claims the benefit of provisional application No. 60/142,891 filed on July 8, 1999, which is prior to the effective date of Shacham. Therefore, Shacham is not prior art for the instant application. As a result, the teachings of Shacham cannot be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the pending claims. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, and 14-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hobson in view of Fischer in view of Peleg in view of Shacham and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,740 to Curiger et al. (herein "Curiger").

For reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1, Shacham cannot be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the pending claims. Curiger does not provide the missing teaching or suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 6/25/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
658684\_1.DOC